Remarks

In view of the following discussion, the applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U. S. C. § 103. Thus, the applicants believe that all of these claims are in allowable form.

REJECTIONS

A. 35 U. S. C. § 103

1. Claims 1 and 25-26 are not obvious over Martinez in view of Henderson et al.

Claims 1 and 25-26 stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) as obvious over Martinez (U. S. Patent 5,812,184 issued September 22, 1998) in view of Henderson Et al. (U. S. Patent 4,106,059 issued August 8, 1978). The applicants submit that these claims are not rendered obvious by the combination of these references.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for reducing the visual effects of an artifact in a line scan portion of a television display having a scan frequency of f_h (*see*, specification at page 2, lines 26-33). The method includes determining if the artifact has a controllable frequency and is attributable to a periodic signal generated in the television display (*see*, specification at page 3, lines 3-12). If the artifact has a controllable frequency and is attributable to a periodic signal generated in the television display, calculating a value for the frequency of the periodic signal to be an odd harmonic of $f_h/2$ (*see*, specification at page 3, lines 19-23). Thereafter, the calculated value for the frequency of the periodic signal is rounded to an integer number of kHz (*see*, specification at page 3, lines 23-26).

Finally, the frequency of the periodic signal is set to be equal to the rounded value (*see*, specification at page 3, lines 19-26).

Martinez discloses an interactive television and data transmission system (T-NET) (*see*, Martinez at column 1, lines 17-19). Martinez adds 2-way communication capability to cable television (CATV) systems (*see*, Martinez at column 2, lines 20-23). In one embodiment, a viewer's digital response is transmitted during a video portion on one or several pre-assigned TV horizontal scan lines which also carry regular video pictures to the viewer (*see*, Martinez at FIG. 7 and column 9, lines 28-35). The viewer's digital response data rate must equal an odd harmonic of one-half the standard TV horizontal scan rate (*see*, Martinez at column 9, lines 40-43). In a first example, the frequency of the viewer's digital response is at a multiple of 455 times one-half the horizontal scan rate in a frequency of 3.579545 MHz (*see*, Martinez at column 13, lines 57-63). In a second example, the viewer's digital response has a frequency of 2.006118 MHz, which is 255 times one-half the horizontal scan frequency (*see*, Martinez at column 14, lines 59-63). These two examples signify that a frequency with a resolution of at least one Hz can be specified down to at least the third decimal place for example, as follows: 2,006,118.881 Hz (225 x 0.5 x 15,734.26573 Hz) and 3,579,545.454 Hz (455 x 0.5 x 15,734.26573 Hz).

Martinez does not disclose or suggest a method for reducing the visual effects of an artifact in a line scan portion of a television display having a scan frequency of f_h by calculating a value for the frequency of the periodic signal to be an odd harmonic of $f_h/2$, rounding the calculated value for the frequency of the periodic signal to an integer number of kHz and setting the frequency of the periodic signal to be equal to the rounded value. Rather, Martinez only teaches that the viewer's response digital data rate must equal an odd harmonic of one-half the standard TV horizontal scan rate. Additionally, Martinez teaches away from rounding the calculated frequency to the unit of KHz, which is 1000 times the frequency disclosed therein, by specifying the two frequencies to the unit of Hz. Since Martinez does not disclose or suggest a method for reducing the visual

effects of an artifact in a line scan portion of a television display having a scan frequency of f_h by calculating a value for the frequency of the periodic signal to be an odd harmonic of $f_h/2$, rounding the calculated value for the frequency of the periodic signal to an integer number of kHz and setting the frequency of the periodic signal to be equal to the rounded value, claims 1 and 25-26 are not rendered obvious by Martinez.

Henderson et al. discloses a phase locked loop tuner for a television receiver (*see*, Henderson et al. at column 1, lines 8-11). The phase locked loop tuner uses a reference frequency that is an odd harmonic of one-half the horizontal scanning rate and a harmonic of the vertical scanning rate (*see*, Henderson et al. at column 5, lines 45-60).

Henderson et al. does not disclose or suggest a method for reducing the visual effects of an artifact in a line scan portion of a television display having a scan frequency of f_h by calculating a value for the frequency of the periodic signal to be an odd harmonic of $f_h/2$, rounding the calculated value for the frequency of the periodic signal to an integer number of kHz and setting the frequency of the periodic signal to be equal to the rounded value. Rather, Henderson et al. only teaches use of a phase locked loop tuner having a reference frequency that is an odd harmonic of one-half the horizontal scanning rate and a harmonic of the vertical scanning rate. Since Henderson et al. does not disclose or suggest a method for reducing the visual effects of an artifact in a line scan portion of a television display having a scan frequency of f_h by calculating a value for the frequency of the periodic signal to be an odd harmonic of $f_h/2$, rounding the calculated value for the frequency of the periodic signal to an integer number of kHz and setting the frequency of the periodic signal to be equal to the rounded value, claims 1 and 25-26 are not rendered obvious by Henderson et al.

Furthermore, since Martinez only teaches that the viewer's response digital data rate must equal an odd harmonic of one-half the standard TV horizontal scan rate and Henderson et al. only teaches use of a phase locked loop tuner having a reference frequency that is an odd harmonic of one-half the

horizontal scanning rate and a harmonic of the vertical scanning rate, the combination of these references does not describe or suggest applicants method. In particular, claims 1 and 25-26 recite a method for reducing the visual effects of an artifact in a line scan portion of a television display having a scan frequency of f_h by calculating a value for the frequency of the periodic signal to be an odd harmonic of $f_h/2$, rounding the calculated value for the frequency of the periodic signal to an integer number of kHz and setting the frequency of the periodic signal to be equal to the rounded value. Thus, claims 1 and 25-26 are patentable over the combination of these references.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U. S. C. § 103. Consequently, the applicants believe that all of the claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Ms. Patricia A. Verlangieri, at (609) 734-6867, so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia A. Verlangieri, Attorney
Reg. No. 42,201
(609) 734-6867

Thomson Inc.
P. O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

December 15, 2004